



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,100	11/19/2001	Jun Haneda	VN-0158US	8071
28017	7590	12/22/2003	EXAMINER	
RYUKA 1-24-12 SHINJUKU, SIXTH FLOOR TOSHIN BUILDING, SHINJUKU-KU TOKYO, 160-0022 JAPAN			OSMAN, RAMY M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2157		6

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/683,100	HANEDA, JUN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ramy M Osman	2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 9-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim language is unclear in regards to the meaning and implementation for address status being set to “in use” or “no use”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,8,15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,868).

3. In reference to claims 1 and 16, Peters teaches an address conversion apparatus for connecting a first network to a second network, comprising:

A receiving unit that receives a first SNMP trap from a communication apparatus in said first network (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c,

Peters discloses a peer agent receiving an SNMP trap from a communication device in a network);

A converter that changes a predetermined part in said first trap to generate a second SNMP trap (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c, Peters discloses converting the trap indication to another format thus generating another trap),

A transmitting unit that transmits said second trap generated by said converter to a monitoring apparatus of said communication apparatus in said second network (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c, Peters discloses transmitting second/formatted trap to a monitoring SNMP agent on another network).

4. In reference to claims 8 and 15, Peters teaches an address conversion apparatus for connecting a first network to a second network, comprising:

A receiving unit that receives a first SNMP trap from a communication apparatus in said first network (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c, Peters discloses a peer agent receiving an SNMP trap from a communication device in a network);

Holding unit that holds said first trap (column 6 lines 37-55, column 7 lines 20-40, Peters discloses an instrumentation abstraction component where the traps are sent to be held for further processing);

Transmitting unit that transmits a second SNMP trap based on said first SNMP trap to a monitoring apparatus of said communication apparatus in said second network (column 2 lines 29-67, column 6 lines 10-67, column 7 lines 1-41 & figure 6c, Peters discloses transmitting second/formatted SNMP trap to a monitoring SNMP agent on another network); and

A reading unit that reads said first trap from said holding unit in response to a read request of said first trap, corresponding to said second trap, from said monitoring apparatus, and transmits said first trap to said monitoring apparatus (column 6 lines 37-55, column 7 lines 20-40, Peters discloses an instrumentation abstraction component where the traps are sent to be held for further processing, and transmits trap to SNMP monitoring agent).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. Claims 2,4,5,7,14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,868) in view of Veerina et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,379).
7. In reference to claims 2 and 5, Peters teaches an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 1. Peters fails to teach wherein said converter changes said predetermined part of an agent address part in said first trap to a value corresponding to an address in said second network to generate said second SNMP trap. However, Veerina teaches translating an IP address to an external IP address to allow transmission to an external network (abstract, column 3 lines 39-67 and column 4 lines 29-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by as per the teachings of Veerina so as to perform multiplexing over different network links.

Art Unit: 2157

8. In reference to claims 4 and 7, Peters teaches an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 2. Peters fails to teach wherein said converter changes said predetermined part of a port number in said first trap to information for identifying said communication apparatus in said first network to generate said second trap. However, Veerina teaches translating a port number to an external port number to allow transmission to an external network (abstract, column 3 lines 36-67, column 4 lines 29-67 and column 6 lines 30-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by as per the teachings of Veerina so as to perform multiplexing over different network links.

9. In reference to claims 14 and 18, Peters in view of Veerina teach an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 1 above, including a monitoring apparatus receiving an SNMP trap transmitted by a communication apparatus via an address conversion apparatus, wherein said monitoring apparatus includes a specifying unit that specifies said communication apparatus based on an agent address part in said trap. Peters fails to teach wherein the communication apparatus is specified based on port number part of trap. However, Veerina teaches translating a port number to an external port number to allow transmission to an external network (abstract, column 3 lines 36-67, column 4 lines 29-67 and column 6 lines 30-67).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by as per the teachings of Veerina so as to perform multiplexing over different network links.

10. Claims 3,6,13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279) in view of Veerina et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,379) in further view of Spencer (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,243).

11. In reference to claims 3 and 6, Peters in view of Veerina teaches an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claim 2 above, and using information for identifying said communication apparatus in said first network to generate said second trap. They fail to teach wherein said converter changes said predetermined part of a time stamp part in said first trap. However, Spencer teaches an SNMP trap with a timestamp field indicating when the trap was generated (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 7 lines 1-55).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by making the converter change time stamp part in said first trap as per the teachings of Spencer so as to specify a communication apparatus for the second trap.

12. In reference to claims 13 and 17, Peters in view of Veerina teach an address conversion apparatus as claimed in claims 1 and 2 above, including a monitoring apparatus receiving an SNMP trap transmitted by a communication apparatus via an address conversion apparatus, wherein said monitoring apparatus includes a specifying unit that specifies said communication apparatus based on an agent address part in said trap. They fail to teach wherein the communication apparatus is specified based on time stamp part of trap. However, Spencer teaches an SNMP trap with a timestamp field indicating when the trap was generated (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 7 lines 1-55).

It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Peters by making the converter change time stamp part in said first trap as per the teachings of Spencer so as to specify a communication apparatus for the second trap.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Patent No. US006631407B1
- Patent No. US005251205A
- Patent No. US005490252A
- Patent No. US006598071B1
- Patent No. US006425005B1
- Patent No. US006058431A
- Patent No. US006314476B1

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8050. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 305-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

RMO
December 3, 2003



ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100